

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/869,123 | 10/03/2001 | Karsten Reihs | 2354 | |
| 22850 | 7590 10/28/2004 | • | EXAMINER | |
| OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET | | | BISSETT, MELANIE D | |
| · · · | A, VA 22314 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1711 | 8 |

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/869,123 | REIHS ET AL. | , | | | | |
| ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | Melanie D. Bissett | 1711 | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 29 September 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | | | |
| | EPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A | | | | | | | |
| no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the control of timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 Classical or control of timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. | If extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply one to later than three months after the mail FR 1.704(b). | unt of the fee. The appro originally set in the final C ing date of the final reject | opriate extension Office action; or tion, even if | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 29 July 2004. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | | | |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require furthe | | ee NOTE below); | | | | | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be | • | | | | | | |
| (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.NOTE: | | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection | on(s): | | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | | |
| 5.⊠ The a)⊠ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)⊠ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | | | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered beca raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | use it is not directed SOLELY to | issues which were | newly | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(sexplanation of how the new or amended claims work | s) a)⊡ will not be entered or b)[uld be rejected is provided belov | ☐ will be entered an w or appended. | ıd an | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement | t(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | · | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the declaration is not sufficient to overcome the present rejections. The applicant has not shown how the data has been taken directly from the examples of the reference and incorporated into the calculations according to the present invention. It is unclear how the areal densities and tip diameters have been used to provide the results shown; it would be helpful to see the calculations to better understand where such variables fit into the claimed equation. Furthermore, the examiner would maintain the rejection based on 35 USC 112. Although the applicant argues that the examples are sufficient to show one of skill in the art how to arrive at the claimed invention, the examiner maintains that undue experimentation would be required.

James J. Seidleck
Supervisory Patent Examinor
Technology Center 1700